

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOEL DRUM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-56472

D.C. No. CV-06-00214-JFW

MEMORANDUM *

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
John F. Walter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 20, 2007**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Joel Drum, a California attorney who was suspended from the practice of law for misconduct, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction his action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

due process violations arising out of his State Bar disciplinary proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's jurisdictional dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly concluded that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred Drum's action because it is a "forbidden de facto appeal" of suspension proceedings, and raises constitutional claims that are "inextricably intertwined" with prior state court decisions. *Id.* at 1158; *see also Mothershed v. Justices of the Supreme Court*, 410 F.3d 602, 607-08 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding that district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine to adjudicate attorney's challenge to his State Bar disciplinary proceedings).

Drum's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.